

## **REMARKS**

### **The Amendments**

Claim 1 is amended to specify the variables for R<sup>1</sup> so that the proviso at the end of the claim is no longer necessary and can be deleted. As a result, the definitions of the other R groups are modified to replace reference to the R<sup>1</sup> groups with a specific recitation of those groups originally defined for R<sup>1</sup>.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuing and/or divisional applications directed to any subject matter disclosed in the application which has been canceled by any of the above amendments.

### **The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

The sole ground of rejection considered in the Board's Decision on the appeal was whether the claims had adequate written description support under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Specifically, the issue was whether the proviso recited at the end of claim 1 had adequate written description. The Board decided that the proviso did not have adequate written description. Accordingly, the above amendment specifies the variables (as fully supported by the disclosure) such that the proviso becomes unnecessary and is removed. Since the proviso was the sole basis for finding the claims unpatentable, the amended claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Sopp/

John A. Sopp, Reg. No. 33,103  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO  
& BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Telephone: (703) 243-6333  
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: MERCK-2740

Date: February 5, 2009